

REMARKS

Preliminary Matters:

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim to priority and receipt of the priority document. Further, it is noted with appreciation that the Examiner has considered the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement. Finally, Applicants have amended the Abstract of the Disclosure to be in conformance with U.S. Patent practice.

Claims 1-11 are all the claims pending in the application.

Specification Objection

The Examiner objected to the specification for various informalities. Applicants submit the present amendments to the abstract obviate this objection.

Regarding the reference to an unpublished U.S. application in the objection, Applicants submit only a U.S. Patents are incorporated by reference.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite.

Applicants submit the present amendments to the claims obviate this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Markman

(U.S. Patent No. 5,962,834).

Arguments:

Applicants respectfully disagree with the opinion of the Examiner who considers that Markman anticipates the present invention.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a mobile device for collecting and validating collected articles, each equipped with a transponder and wherein the mobile device further comprises radio-

frequency (RF) interrogation means for obtaining identifying information on each of the articles collected by the device.

As can be seen in Figures 1 to 3, Markman discloses a label or flexible packet (14) which contains identification codes (20, 22, 24, 26). However, this label, which may correspond to the transponder recited in claim 1, is attached to an article or a group of articles.

However, in Markman, as disclosed in column 6 lines 16 to 18 and column 7 lines 25 to 30, these identification codes are captured at one or more points (i.e. fixing points; see the tracking stations of figure 5) along the conveyor path.

To the contrary, in the present invention as recited in claim 1, the tracking station (REID reader/interrogator) is mobile with the RFID tag because one and the other are fixed on the the mobile device for collecting and validating collected articles of the invention. Consequently, all errors or articles missing are immediately detected when the garments are received on the mobile device. In the present invention as recited in claim 1, the articles may be detected before they pass a remote fixed tracking station.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Markman fails to disclose “wherein the mobile device further comprises radio-frequency (RF) interrogation means for obtaining identifying information on each of the articles collected by the device,” as recited in claim 1.

Thus, Applicants submit claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason. Additionally, Applicants submit claims 2-11 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 24, 2008